

March 22, 2015 (#1495)  
"Cutting Through the Matrix" with Alan Watt  
(Blurb, i.e. Educational Talk)

**"Bill C-51 and Reign of Terror?"**  
**History Shows Us Law is Used, Now don't Forget,**  
**For Tyrants to Harm Those They're Meant to Protect"**

© Alan Watt March 22, 2015

Title & Dialogue Copyrighted Alan Watt - March 15, 2015 (Exempting  
Music and Literary Quotes)

---

[cuttingthroughthematrix.com](http://cuttingthroughthematrix.com)

alternate sites:

[cuttingthroughthematrix.net](http://cuttingthroughthematrix.net) , [.us](http://cuttingthroughthematrix.us) , [.ca](http://cuttingthroughthematrix.ca)  
[alanwattcuttingthroughthematrix.ca](http://alanwattcuttingthroughthematrix.ca)

mirror site:

[cuttingthrough.jenkness.com](http://cuttingthrough.jenkness.com)

European site includes all audios & downloadable TRANSCRIPTS in European  
languages for print up:

[alanwattsentientsentinel.eu](http://alanwattsentientsentinel.eu)

---

**Information for purchasing Alan's books, CDs, DVDs and  
DONATIONS:**

**Canada and America:** PayPal, Cash, personal checks &  
for the US, **INTERNATIONAL** postal money orders / for Canada, INTERNAL postal  
money orders

(America: Postal Money orders - Stress the **INTERNATIONAL** pink one, not the green  
internal one.)

**Outside the Americas:** PayPal, Cash, Western Union and Money Gram  
(Money Gram is cheaper; even cheaper is a Money Gram check - in Canadian dollars:  
mail via the postal services worldwide.)

**PayPal Orders: USE THE [DONATE](#) BUTTON ON THE WEBSITE - AND -**  
Send a separate email along with the donation (list your order, name and address)

**Click the link below for your location (ordering info):**

[USA](#)

[Canada](#)

[Europe/Scandinavian](#)

[All Other Countries](#)

---

Hi folks, I'm Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix on March 22, 2015. I'm sure all those south of the border there are getting happier and happier by the day as spring seems to be coming into view. And up here where I am it's still darned cold and lots of snow, and it snowed again last night just to prove the point. But at least it's getting a bit milder at night, it's still going to hit into the sub zeros tomorrow and the next day or so. But who knows, over the next week or two it should start to improve. And there's actually some very hazy chem-sprayed sunlight coming through now so it cheers up the situation a little bit for a lot of people up this way.

But you know, I've talked for years and years about the big agenda and to show

you that you're living through plannedscript basically, an agenda. I've gone through the documentation of world planners, the big groups involved, the private clubs in fact, who also have many members within parliaments and congresses across the world, and they have members all through the bureaucracies too. That's very important, bureaucracies, to make sure that they are given their agendas too. They all must work independently of politicians to an extent in specialist departments because the heads of those departments are well schooled in what their big agenda is for their working lifetime. They hire and work and retire, and higher and work and retire, *for generations*.

And that's how foundations also work, the big private foundations that were put up by the big banks, private bankers and corporations who decided to use our tax money, the tax-free money that is because they have an exemption as a charitable system basically, to create nongovernmental organizations which they can then use to push, from the public's perspective it seems to come from the grassroots, and they push and demand from government to have certain laws passed, that simply coincides with the big agenda of course. The Greening agenda, the global warming agenda, the climate change agenda, and all these different agendas, and Agenda 21, are all under the umbrella of the United Nations, which was set up, remember, by a private organization of the extremely rich people of their day.

Now, these big foundations do the same thing. They hire, they work a life's career within these foundations, many of the people, and they retire. Hire, work and retire. So they can set an agenda 100, 200 years ago and continue the same policy and goals down through centuries until they achieve the goals. Different from, say, the art of politics, as far as the public perceive it, where parties are simply voted in and out, and in and out and so on, never even knowing that the leaders of the parties *all* belong to *the same private club*. So everything is managed, naturally, if you want to bring in your particular view of the world, under control from birth to death for every citizen, with eugenics systems on the go and big plans with who breeds with whom, if they can breed at all, and give licenses to do so, all these plans, etc., and eventually creating humanoids, cyborg types, and then into the full genetic creations of the new kind of Superman, for the upper elite that is, then you must control every facet of society and culture. And culture of course is very important. The culture industry updates your culture and you copy it. You copy the words, the terms that are put out there within the movies, never realizing you're being conditioned to accept things that if you were really, really thinking about it and rational about it and reasoned through it all, you wouldn't simply accept them. You're preprogrammed to accept what comes down the pike in reality.

Also tonight I'm going to touch on another topic that I talked about years ago. I mentioned I think back in 2005 or 2006 I'd never touched a computer in my life. I had been on the radio long before but I had never touched a computer. Because I knew the goal of the computer, it was eventually to monitor every single person, all their email and what they're chatting about and so on, and also that governments would use supercomputers, which they boasted about back in the 90s, the big Cray computers, to gather all data and information about every single individual in real time. So I knew it was for the agenda's sake and not for our sake. Their little window of opportunity, as it's called, where people could chat back and forth, has been carefully monitored and scrutinize from the very, very beginning, laws or no laws, I don't care what they say actually.

You'll find that one or two years ago Brzezinski, at one of the CFR meetings, the Council on Foreign Relations, said that the people were becoming politicized, in other words they were becoming aware, consciously aware of the big geopolitical programs that were going on and agendas put out by, worked in fact, by many members of the Council on Foreign Relations/ Trilateral Commission and so on. That got out a cry at the time for one of the Rockefellers who wanted a bill to get through to censor the Internet. Now, these boys don't put ideas forward and then forget them because they're going to get backlash. They simply go back to the drawing table and find other ways to bring it in. And under the guise of antiterrorism they have changed the whole system. And you can't argue with it because it's to keep you safe, that's the excuse. And that's the plausible excuse. Remember, for everything that happens in politics there's a good reason, and then there's a real reason. You're always given the good reason but you're never given the real reason. And the same thing goes on here.

Obviously information has always been controlled. That's why folk were kept in absolute illiteracy for centuries, in fact, in many countries because knowledge is power. And the communication from old books and so on, ideas from even ancient Greece for instance, could be used to radicalize people, at least that's what was thought at the time by those in control, and bring their systems down. So they wanted the people to be illiterate, especially the ones who were at the bottom of the ladder, who had very little and worked the hardest of course.

Because everything in our system, like Marx said, which was one of the... Don't ever throw things out the window, even Marx said a lot of truths; they had to have self-evident truths to get people on board, and that's what they always use, different groups. Marx said that, all wealth comes from the workers, the people's labor, from labor itself, and it simply goes up the ladder and gets sold many times and so on, to the finished produce, and then it's taxed, and then the worker is taxed again too now. So, we are the business. I've always said that, we are the business, the public are the business.

So anyway, I always knew that the Internet would come to an end through the guises it's going through, and I'll be touching on that tonight too because it's all very real, all the laws are being passed. And laws or no laws, they've already been doing it regardless. This metadata stuff is utter rubbish, always was rubbish. Which means... Well, they're collecting the metadata but it's only on who you contact, when you contacted them, and so on, who contacted you. Which is rubbish. They've been collecting the *contents*, the *entire contents* of telephone calls and emails and texting, all along... all along. Naturally, they would never ever forego the opportunity to know everything about you, and they certainly do.

And now an old... a technique is coming in, and it works awfully, awfully well. It's been in place for a while but it can be used across the board, and it's definitely going to be used on the Internet now, where you self-police yourself. When you put a camera up in the streets, for instance, they know this from many, many, many repeated experiments. Your behavior, if you are on camera your behavior will change when you know you're on camera. You will behave less spontaneously, you are aware you're being watched and you self-police yourself. It's a term used at the United Nations, they even used it that the League of Nations before it became the United Nations, of that's how they would train the public, constant, lifelong

education also includes self-policing. The other part of that starts in youth where they use cognitive and neuroscience, behaviorism to condition the children into Pavlovian responses to certain topics and so on, so they simply get set back to what is called their default position, they won't even look into something. Even if they feel uncomfortable with it, whatever that something happens to be, they feel more uncomfortable going against their indoctrination. So never ignore these sciences and think that it doesn't affect you. It affects everybody, believe you me.

Now, the old group that was behind so much of what happened in the 1800s through the 1900s, into the 20th century, in the early 20th century it was called the Lord Alfred Milner group. They had different names of course, they didn't want their name to be known to the general public and they had what is called Roundtable societies, which they would bring in future leaders in all different areas of commerce and even local governments, up to the federal government positions, in different countries. They eventually became the Royal Institute of International Affairs, another private group made up of elitists' sons and top bankers of the day, international lenders that lent to whole nations. Their idea was to take over the wealth of all countries and bring in a world system under their control. They set up the Council on Foreign Relations for the US, the same organization actually as the Royal Institute of International Affairs. And they set up the League of Nations and the United Nations too, to do their bidding basically, where they could bring people in for conferences and gradually, through treaties, merge them together into trading blocs, and then into a global world system, with a Parliament which, again, would be under the control of themselves and the magnates, the power magnets and financiers of their time, right down to the present day.

It hasn't stopped. It has almost achieved its goal. They would use war and catastrophes and so on to their advantage. That's where the phrase comes from, how can we use this catastrophe or crisis to our advantage? And they certainly understand the science of doing this because they've done it all along. In their own private documentation, their own private archives for history, because they have a different version of history, because they know what was behind different things like the Boer war and World War I and so on. Professor Carroll Quigley was given access to them as their historian, for a while. He wrote in his own books, which were published, that this group had existed for an awful long time, every president and prime minister really since the late 1800s belong to this private organization, of all parties, it doesn't matter what party you vote in. And he said that, their goals were, he believed in their goals, Quigley himself believed in their goals, he just disagreed with some of the means by which they achieve their goals. Now, he also said in **The Anglo-American Establishment**, that they had been responsible for the Boer war, getting that all kicked off to take over all the land, that became Rhodesia, South Africa, and the gold and diamonds and so on, resources, wealth and power, because wealth to them is power you see. It hasn't stopped today, now it's oil and everything else, all the minerals, etc.

So it's a very old agenda, run by a private organization at the top. It runs both the left wing, the Fabian Society groups, and the right wing groups. That way when you want to try to oppose something... Most folk will join a group that exists to oppose them, and they are ready made for you like a tailor-made suit, you just slip it on and become one of the group, you see, not realizing that the one at the top has a different agenda from all the followers. That's standard procedure, standard.

Even Lenin said the same thing for the Soviet system, the Bolshevik system, how to defuse all other conflicting parties, or similar parties, when they first got in and they're coming into office as the Bolshevik party. He said, what we do is supply the leaders and create the parties. Or, if they don't exist create them and put your leaders in. If they already exist simply get your own guys in at the top, and then you can lead them wherever you want to. And that's all happened, you see. Old techniques, very old, much older than Lenin, of course. Machiavelli basically did it awfully, awfully well, as a study course on how, a how-to for tyrants basically, [Alan chuckles.], and for those that want to secretly take over systems, and whole peoples, and their rights in fact taken away from them too, under very good sounding guises at times.

Therefore the world is living in an agenda. A crisis or the threat of crisis has to exist. If there's no real facts for the threat you create bogus stuff for the facts, and you get lots of scientists on board who all agree on it. And you can't argue with science, right, that's what you're taught, and therefore you go along with whatever they say, to get a whole agenda through. Now, long ago, back in the days when HG Wells and George Bernard Shaw and others belonged to the Fabian Society, the left-wing party for the Royal Institute of International Affairs, they also set up the world Parliament Association, world parliamentarians. You can even find it in much older poetry in fact by top poets about *the world parliamentarians*, the Parliament of the World. They believed that they could, again, achieve this goal of controlling the whole planet, and its wealth, and all of its people's, by creating a world Parliament. Another branch of it was called the Federalist Society. They are both on the go today, still. Many associations, well-financed, they're always working quietly, day and night, generation after generation, to achieve their objectives. Then they have sub parties underneath it, subgroups that deal... big ones too mind you. They deal with the unification of the Americas, the Council of America's for instance. And of course they had the ones for Europe, the total integration of Europe. All created by a group at the top a long time ago, the Lord Alfred Milner group that became the Royal Institute of International Affairs. Now, tonight I'm going to put up links, for instance, to different articles. The first one is this one here and it says:

## **Call for a World Parliament reinforced at second Global Week of Action**

[unpacampaign.org/news/759.php](http://unpacampaign.org/news/759.php)

*(Alan: And this is from the United Nations, and the campaign for a United Nations.)*

Citizens in over forty locations around the world celebrate second Global Week of Action for a World Parliament

Between the 17th and 26<sup>th</sup> of October, the call for the establishment of a democratically elected global parliament took center stage again at events and actions around the world held on the occasion of the second Global Week of Action for a World Parliament. The week of action's announcement declares that people across the world feel to be voiceless in global decision-making. It says that "world's citizens (A: ...like the world citizens Association...) have little influence on decisions taken at institutions such as

the UN, the IMF, the WTO, the World Bank, the G20 or the G8.” (A: *Actually, you have no say in the UN, or the IMF, a private organization, the WTO, a private organization. All of the world groups, the World Bank and so on, the G20 and the G8, were set up and all their outlines for their existence chartered and drawn up by the CFR, the American branch, or the Canadian branch, or the Australian branch, or whatever, or the British branch, of the Royal Institute of International Affairs.*) Further it states that the governments represented in these bodies are “often being influenced heavily by the lobbyists of global corporations.” (A: *See, the people are aware of that, again, they have become politically awakened, you see. So here's their way to get around that, but making you think they're doing something about it.*) An elected world parliament, by contrast, “would be an instrument to find and implement solutions that are democratic, accountable and serve the best interest of humanity.” (A: *Well, who decides what the best interests of humanity is? They're all on board with the idea of science running the whole show, folks. All of them, it doesn't matter what side or wing you take it from, it's always the same agenda, and always lovely sounding things, you know.*)

To underpin this message, citizens came together in over forty locations around the world and displayed banners with the week's slogan “World Parliament Now!”. Panel discussions on the subject were held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, Berlin, Germany, Rajkot, India, Verona, Italy, Kigali, Rwanda, and Gothenburg, Sweden. At the event in Berlin, the global coordinator of the international campaign for a UN Parliamentary Assembly, Andreas Bummel, said that it was high time to recognize that “global governance isn't working”. (A: *...meaning, the way it is right now.*) “It is not working because it is not delivering the results quickly enough to ensure a decent life for every human being and for a transition to a sustainable global civilization. (A: *So you're back to the sustainable part too. You have the usual, the age in transition, this is the transitory age, you see, as they push through their whole century of change agenda, which again, came out of the top boys, the same group at the top.*) At the same time, the system is deeply undemocratic. Both of these problems are interlinked,” he stated.

“It has been a successful action week with significant events and powerful photos from around the world. Step by step our message is gaining ground. And next year even more people will join us in our call for global democracy and universal peace and justice,” the week's coordinator Petter Ölmunger concluded.

So I'll put this link up tonight for those who care it all to look into it. Most folk today don't want to look into things because they think anything... They've been trained, actually, as Brzezinski said in the 1970s, that their reasoning will be done by the media. In other words, you look to the media to do your thinking and reasoning for you, and most folk do. They prattle on one day what they've heard on the news the previous day. And if the media tells you to worry about prostitutes or young girls being turned to prostitution in Nigeria or somewhere, it's on the lips of everyone the next day. But anything that really matters to you, or your purse, or livelihood or anything, the media won't mention it. So if they don't mention it, you see, you won't worry about it. The media has to say, *be concerned, be very very concerned*. If they don't say that most folk will think, *well if it's really dangerous to me or my way of living they would tell me*. That's how the people think, that the

media is there to do their reasoning for them.

Now, this article here talks about:

## **'Freedom in jeopardy': Thousands rally across Canada against new anti-terror law**

*(A: ...because now it's time to rope in the Internet, obviously.)*

rt.com / March 15, 2015

Thousands of demonstrators have united across Canada to take action against proposed anti-terrorism legislation known as Bill C-51, which would expand the powers of police and the nation's spy agency, especially when it comes to detaining terror suspects.

Organizers of the 'Day of Action' said that "over 70 communities" across Canada were planning to participate on Saturday, according to StopC51.ca. *(A: Now, on this particular article too, which I'll put up the link tonight, you'll get other links within the actual article itself.)*

The biggest gatherings were reported in Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver, Ottawa and Halifax.

"I'm really worried about democracy, this country is going in a really bad direction, [Prime Minister Stephen] Harper is taking it in a really bad direction," protester Stuart Basden from Toronto, the Canadian city which saw hundreds of people come out, told The Star.

"Freedom to speak out against the government is probably in jeopardy...even if you're just posting stuff online you could be targeted, so it's a really terrifying bill," Basden added.

The ruling Conservative government tabled the legislation back in January, arguing that the new law would improve the safety of Canadians.

Anti terror bill is labeled as being 'too vague'

Demonstrators across the nation held signs and chanted against the bill, which they believe violates Canadian civil liberties and online privacy rights.

*(A: I really don't think you have any privacy rights at all, as it is, and as it has been from the beginning.)*

Protester Holley Kofluk told CBC News that the legislation "lacked specificity...it's just so much ambiguity, it leaves people open and vulnerable."

One of the protest organizers in Collingwood, Jim Pinkerton, shared with QMI Agency that he would like to see the Canadian government "start over with Bill C-51 with proper safeguards and real oversight."

"We need CSIS to be accountable. *(A: That's the security intelligence agency.)* It's not OK for CSIS to act as the police, which is what's indicated in Bill C-51. We need accountability and Canadians deserve that," Pinkerton said.

The Day of Action is being backed by more than 30 civil liberties groups, including Amnesty International Canada, LeadNow, OpenMedia, Canadian Journalists for Free Expression, the Council for Canadians, and others.

One of the biggest concerns the new legislation raises is the additional powers it grants to police and Canada's spy agency - the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) - by increasing information sharing and allowing detention on mere suspicion.

"This bill disproportionately targets indigenous communities, environmental activists, dissidents, and Muslims, many of whom are already subjected to questionable and overreaching powers by security officials, and will make it easier and ostensibly lawful for government to continue infringing upon the rights of peaceful people," StopC51.ca said.

The government 'rejects the argument'

A spokesman for Public Safety Minister Steven Blaney, Jeremy Laurin, spoke in support of the bill on Saturday, telling CBC News that the government "rejects the argument that every time we talk about security, our freedoms are threatened." (*A: What an awful thing to say, that, or a statement like that, if you understand history at all.*)

"Canadians understand that their freedom and security go hand in hand and expect us to protect both, and there are safeguards in this legislation to do exactly that," Laurin said.

Blaney's parliamentary secretary, Roxanne James, also issued comments of support, saying she was happy to answer any questions or concerns about the proposed law.

"Most people across Canada believe that if one branch of government comes across information pertinent to the national security of this country and the safety and security of our citizens, then that branch of government should be able to relay that information to our national security agencies," James said. "That is precisely what Bill C-51 would do, and I was pleased to be able to answer those concerns."

So, it's all coming down, obviously. But if you look at the old ideas, that I mentioned at the beginning, of the Alfred Milner group which became the Royal Institute of International Affairs/Council on Foreign Relations/Trilateral commission and so on, they themselves already had information to an extent sewn up back in their day. Quigley even admits that too in his books, because the members of it were all the media moguls too and they were always putting false information into the newspapers for their own particular purposes and to sway the opinion of the general population. So naturally when you go into the age of television and the Internet it's the same bunch who still control it. Separate information from a big power would be very, very dangerous to anyone's particular agenda. So it's quite natural that they simply keep at it and at it, and make sure that whatever information is out there to the public is what they desire to be out there. Generally it's never complete information of course, and also a lot of it is



simply omitted, the rest of the story is simply omitted which leads you to the wrong conclusion, which to them is the right conclusion that they want you to have. It's quite easy, isn't it?

This other article here from the Toronto Star says the Canadian Security Intelligence Service:

## **CSIS highlights white supremacist threat ahead of radical Islam**

thestar.com / Alex Boutilier Staff Reporter / Mar 15 2015

*(A: ...AHEAD of radical Islam . This is amazing. But again, getting back to the Royal Institute of International Affairs, they created the term 'the British Commonwealth', 'the Commonwealth of Nations'. It sounded better than 'the Empire' or 'Dominion'. So they created that term, and they still have that organization on the go today. Because this organization at the top has members throughout all of the political establishment and the commercial elitist establishment of the Commonwealth Nations. Whenever they passed one thing in one country you'll see it's being passed in another, under a different name, but it's the same thing. And they are doing it all over the British Commonwealth system. So here you have, this stuff getting thrown in here too.)*

Political ideas behind lone wolf attacks "run the gamut," say internal CSIS documents, but they're likelier found in the radical right-wing than in radical Islam.

Ziyaad Mia, of the Canadian Muslim Lawyers Association, says anti-Muslim sentiment in Canada is a growing concern and "some of this xenophobia is being stoked by political leaders."

OTTAWA—"Lone wolf" attacks more often come from white supremacists and extreme right-wing ideologies than from Islamic radicalism, internal CSIS documents say.

Citing recent academic research, the unclassified documents note extreme right-wing and white supremacist ideology has been the "main ideological source" for 17 per cent of so-called lone wolf attacks worldwide.

Islamic extremism accounted for 15 per cent of such attacks, the document noted, while left-wing extremism and "black power" groups followed with 13 per cent. Anti-abortion activism (8 per cent) and nationalism/separatism (7 per cent) rounded out the list, while in 40 per cent of cases there was no clear ideological motivation.

"Lone actors tend to create their own ideologies that combine personal frustrations and grievances, with wider political, social, or religious issues," note the documents prepared for Michael Peirce, assistant director of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service.

"This study confirms that the lone actor terrorism runs the gamut of ideological persuasions."

The documents, obtained by the Star under access to information law, were prepared for Peirce's appearance before a Senate committee on national security in October. His testimony came five days after Michael Zehaf-Bibeau fatally shot Cpl. Nathan Cirillo at the National War Memorial.

In a video recorded minutes before the shooting, Zehaf-Bibeau claimed his actions were in retaliation for Canada's combat missions in Afghanistan and, more recently, in Iraq.

Zehaf-Bibeau's attack came days after Martin Couture-Rouleau ran down Warrant Officer Patrice Vincent in St-Jean-sur-Richelieu. Authorities said Couture-Rouleau was frustrated after he was refused a passport, allegedly to travel to Syria and fight for the Islamic State.

These two attacks have focused the Canadian conversation about domestic terrorism on radical Islam to the exclusion of other potential threats. The Conservative government has repeatedly referred to the attacks to sell its new anti-terror legislation, which would give Canada's spies police-like powers to "disrupt" threats.

Other Canadian lone wolf attacks, such as Justin Bourque's shooting rampage in Moncton last June that left three RCMP officers dead, were not automatically branded as terrorism.

After three people were arrested last month in an alleged plot to open fire in the Halifax Shopping Centre, Justice Minister Peter MacKay called them "murderous misfits" — not terrorists — because their attacks were not "culturally motivated." When reporters later asked MacKay to explain what he considers terrorism, he encouraged them to "look it up" in the Criminal Code.

But Prime Minister Stephen Harper has often referred to the threat of Islamic extremism in the House of Commons, and once mentioned the "jihadist monster" whose "tentacles" reached the Parliament buildings. (A: *They actually have links to his different statements and so on in the Toronto Star.*)

The CSIS documents explicitly warn that the notion the Western world is at war with Islam plays into terrorist recruitment strategies.

"International terrorist groups place a high priority on radicalizing Westerners who can be used to carry out terrorist acts in their home countries," the documents read. "The narrative that the West is at war with Islam continues to exert a very powerful influence in radicalizing individuals and spreads quickly through social media and online fora."

Other CSIS documents, obtained by The Canadian Press, warned the Conservatives last September that there is an emerging anti-Islam movement in Canada, similar to movements in Europe.

And it goes on and on talking about this particular problem. But this is the story that they're giving you in The Star, which always goes left wing and so on. That's

its job, because they always give you a Star and a Sun, which goes the other way. Or Mercury, you see. So they have different papers that give you different ideologies because everything is catered to. Every group you could possibly believe you belong to is catered to by a particular newspaper, that's how it's run. Even the magazines too, Harper's magazine, for instance, was put out and why it was put out and what target group they were putting it out to inform, misinform, whatever it happened to be. That's how information is always used of course.

Now, this article is very good, well written. This article is by Clayton Ruby who is a top lawyer for Canada, for top cases. I think this is his partner too in the business, Nader R. Hasan. And this is put out by Global Research, which if you go into their history is also a left-wing group, Global Research. I think one of the leaders of it actually attends and talks to the world's Marxist associations whenever they have their international meetings, things like that. But the article itself is excellent, by Clayton Ruby, the lawyer. I'll read some of this and it says:

## **Canada's "AntiTerrorism" Bill C-51: A Legal Primer, Expands the Powers of Canada's Spy Agency, Allows Arrest on Mere Suspicion**

globalresearch.ca / March 15, 2015 / Clayton Ruby and Nader R. Hasan

Six Muslim young adults stand in front of a mosque late at night in heated discussion in some foreign language. They may be debating the merits of a new Drake album. They may be talking about video games, or sports, or girls, or advocating the overthrow of the Harper government. Who knows? There is no evidence one way or the other. Just stereotypes. But the new standard for arrest and detention—reason to suspect that they may commit an act—is so low that an officer may be inclined to arrest and detain them in order to investigate further. And now, officers will no longer need to ask themselves whether the arrest is necessary. They could act on mere suspicion that an arrest is likely to prevent any terrorist activity. Yesterday, the Muslim men were freely exercising constitutional rights to freedom of expression and assembly. Today they are to be arrested.

### **Overview: The Anti-Terrorism Act**

Bill C-51, the Anti-Terrorism Act, 2015, would expand the powers of Canada's spy agency, allow Canadians to be arrested on mere suspicion of future criminal activity, (*A: It's like **Minority Report**, the movie, isn't it?*) allow the Minister of Public Safety to add Canadians to a "no-fly list" with illusory rights of judicial review, (*A: In other words, there's no real judicial review.*) and, perhaps most alarmingly, create a new speech-related criminal offence of "promoting" or "advocating" terrorism. These proposed laws are misguided, and many of them are likely also unconstitutional. The bill ought to be rejected as a whole. Repair is impossible.

*(A: And I think he's right on that, you would have to reject the whole thing. Because generally they bring out this same tactic over and over. It's like the gas prices, they say, oh gas prices are going to jump by \$.40 or \$.50. and everybody mumbles and grumbles, oh my God and so on. And they give it a*

week or two. The first statement is a trial balloon to see your reaction, and according to your reaction on the Internet and so on and yapping amongst yourselves, which they have all the data of, instant surveys are done with percentages of who is against it and who is going to be ticked off and so on, then they lower it proportionately according to what you will accept. So when they put it up only \$.15, you say, oh thank God for that. Well, it's the same with these bills too. They often give you the whole shebang to start with, which are terrifying in their completeness actually, and they'll bring it back with certain, again, very, ha, I almost call it mystical wording, which allows them to still go ahead with the same things they wanted to do from the very beginning. It's all done in courts, isn't it, what they say and the words that they use and how they are going to reinterpret it over and over. Like the American Constitution is always getting reinterpreted by lawyers.)

The bill ought to be rejected as a whole. (A: *That's the only way you can do that. They can't accept it or have some compromise.*)

New offence of promoting terrorism

Bill C-51 creates a new criminal offence that likely violates s. 2(b) of the Charter. (A: *That's your charter of rights for Canadians.*) Newly proposed s. 83.221 of the Criminal Code provides as follows:

Every person who, by communication statements (A: *...now, how vague is that...*), knowingly advocates or promotes the commission of terrorism offences in general (A: *Now, terrorism itself is very vague because that can be expanded, and it is being expanded, to include anything at all. Words you use, terms you use, all these things which are outlawed in Canada you can't use. It's been that way for a long time. Again, you go back to self-policing and you get trained and trained and trained throughout your life.*)—other than an offence under this section—while knowing that any of those offences will be committed or being reckless as to whether any of those offences may be committed, (A: *[Alan laughing.] How vague can you get...*) as a result of such communication, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for a term of not more than five years.

The new offence will bring within its ambit all kinds of innocent speech, some of which no doubt lies at the core of freedom of expression values that the Charter was meant to protect. As Professors Kent Roach and Craig Forcese point out, the new offence would sweep within its net the following scenario:

Take just one hypothetical: An academic or foreign affairs columnist opines “we should provide resources to Ukrainian insurgencies who are targeting Russian oil infrastructure, in an effort to increase the political cost of Russian intervention in Ukraine.” The speaker says this knowing that her audience includes support groups who may be sending money to those opposing Russian intervention.

Providing resources to a group, one of whose purposes is a “terrorist activity,” is a terrorism offence. And causing substantial property damage or serious interference with an essential service or system for a political reason and in a way that endangers life, to compel a government to do something, is

a “terrorist activity.” This is so even if it takes place abroad. So a criminal prosecution of the columnist in the hypothetical situation described above is a real possibility under the new law. It is constitutionally unacceptable and dangerous.

The new offence is broader than existing terrorism offences in the Criminal Code in that it does not require an actual terrorist purpose. So someone can be guilty of this offence—like the columnist—despite completely innocent purposes, such as attempting to provoke democratic debate (*A: ...that may be your intention...*), or proposing a solution to an intractable international conflict. The speaker’s purpose does not matter; they are liable if they are reckless as to the risk that a listener “may” thereafter commit an unspecified terrorism offence.

Criminal culpability would extend beyond the speaker of the impugned words. Like all criminal offences, a person can be guilty if they aid or abet the individual who actually commits the offence. Not only the columnist, but also their editors, publishers and research assistants become criminals.

It should be noted that there are other “promoting” and “advocating” offences in the Criminal Code. The Code contains a prohibition on willful promotion of hatred. It also contains a prohibition on advocating sexual activity with underage children. But hate propaganda and sexual activity with underage children are much narrower than the vague reference to “terrorism offences in general.” In addition, unlike willful promotion of hatred, which contains an express exception for communications made in private, the proposed new offence can be applied to statements made in private. (*A: That also means your phone calls, folks, and everything else.*) This is all the more concerning given the Canadian Security Intelligence Service’s (CSIS) expansive anti-terrorism wiretap and surveillance powers.

Another truly bizarre aspect of the new offence is the use of the term “terrorism offences in general—other than an offence under this section.” The Criminal Code already contains 14 broadly worded terrorism-related offences. “Terrorism activity” is a defined term under s. 83.01 of the Criminal Code, but this is broader. It applies to more speech than speech advocating or promoting terrorist activity, or the 14 terrorism offences in the Criminal Code. The new offence is meant to include speech promoting and advocating “terrorism in general,” a deliberately opaque and unknowable term. (*A: And that's why it is that way, it's because they can reinterpret it depending on if they want to get a person in the slammer or not.*)

Even if the government exercises restraint in laying charges and arresting people, the result is an inevitable chill on speech. Students will think twice before posting an article on Facebook questioning military action against insurgents overseas. Journalists will be wary of questioning government decisions to add groups to Canada’s list of terrorist entities.

*(A: In other words, you're getting back to self-policing. And just like being on camera changes your behavior, now once you know this and they get a few suspects to start with, as warnings to everybody else, and that is to make you self-police yourself. This is how these things work out. These are all thought*

*out in think tanks long before they put it all down in words.)*

## New CSIS powers

CSIS was created in 1984 by an Act of Parliament. To that point, security intelligence in Canada was the purview of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) Security Service. However, in the 1970s there were allegations that the RCMP Security Service had been involved in numerous illegal activities. In 1977, as a result of these allegations, Justice David McDonald was appointed to investigate. The McDonald Commission published its final report in 1981, with its main recommendation being that security intelligence work should be separated from policing, and that a civilian intelligence agency should be created to take over from the RCMP Security Service. CSIS was created to be that civilian intelligence agency. At the time of its creation, CSIS was subject to general oversight review by a new body, the Security Intelligence Review Committee (SIRC), which has been starved of resources, as well as by the Office of the Inspector General, which was abolished and disbanded in 2012.

The idea behind CSIS was that abuses of power were less likely to occur if intelligence gathering was separated from law enforcement. (*A: It's awfully important, that, too.*) Bill C-51 erodes the distinction between CSIS's traditional intelligence gathering role by giving it broad new powers to engage in law enforcement-type activities. Under Bill C-51, CSIS would be able to take "measures" to reduce threats to the security of Canada. For example, s. 12.1(1) of the proposed act states,

If there are reasonable grounds to believe that a particular activity constitutes a threat to the security of Canada, the Service may take measures, within or outside Canada, to reduce the threat.

The power under s. 12.1 is broadly defined, giving CSIS virtually unfettered authority to conduct any operation it thinks is in the interest of Canadian security. The definitions are so broad that they could apply to almost anything, including measures to disrupt or interfere with non-violent civil disobedience. Only the following activities are explicitly excluded from these new powers, as per s. 12.2(1) of the act:

In taking measures to reduce a threat to the security of Canada, the Service shall not

(a) cause, intentionally or by criminal negligence, death or bodily harm to an individual;

(b) willfully attempt in any manner to obstruct, pervert or defeat the course of justice; or

(c) violate the sexual integrity of an individual.

These limited exclusions leave CSIS with incredibly expansive powers, including water boarding, inflicting pain (torture) or causing psychological harm to an individual. (*A: They can use drugs on you and things like that.*)

The government has pointed out that in order for CSIS to take measures under s. 12.1, CSIS must first apply for a warrant. Under the warrant provision, a judge may issue a warrant if satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to justify the belief that the requested measures are required to enable CSIS “to reduce a threat to the security of Canada,” and are “reasonable and proportionate.”

This is an odd standard, which judges will find difficult, if not impossible, to apply. *(A: Well, they're not going to go into the fact that there's an old-school-tie thing at work here too, because you'll find there's always crossovers within circles, between security systems, even police, and their circle of judges and so on, and they have their own little codes too they go by, by the way, and things get done which perhaps shouldn't be done.)* The ordinary standard for issuance of a warrant is based on reasonable grounds to believe that a criminal offence has been committed (in the case of a warrant to arrest) or reasonable grounds to believe that the search of a place will afford evidence of an offence (in the case of a search pursuant to judicial warrant). These are determinations that can be made objectively, based on the evidence, by an impartial judicial officer. By contrast, whether a given measure would proportionately “reduce the threat to the security of Canada” is not like these other tests. It amounts to asking judges to look into a crystal ball to determine if Canada will be safer in the future if a CSIS officer takes some measures. This is not a determination that judges are equipped to make. The limits will vary with the judges chosen by CSIS, not with the evidence. *(A: And there will be select ones chosen by CSIS.)*

The expansion of CSIS’s powers is troubling given the RCMP’s notorious history of commingling intelligence gathering and law enforcement. It is also troubling for the additional reason that there is very little oversight of CSIS activities. At present, CSIS is accountable only to the SIRC. CSIS has a budget of over \$500 million annually. SIRC *(A: ...the oversight one...)* has an annual budget of \$3 million and is staffed by four part-time committee members. It no longer has a director general who watches the watchers. By contrast, spy agencies in other countries are supervised by powerful parliamentary or congressional committees. The sweeping new powers, coupled with the woeful lack of oversight, risks turning CSIS into a dangerous “secret police force.”

*(A: For the hard of thinking I'll mention that again.)*

The sweeping new powers, coupled with the woeful lack of oversight, risks turning CSIS into a dangerous “secret police force.”

## Preventive arrest powers

The current anti-terrorism sections of the Criminal Code already contain provisions for preventive arrest, preventive detention and preventive restraints on liberty. Preventive detention is at odds with our legal tradition of only prosecuting and punishing crimes that have been committed already, and only after those offences have been proved by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt. Preventive detention—i.e., detention on the suspicion that someone may or will commit a crime at some point in the future—is the opposite of that legal tradition and is inconsistent with the constitutionally

protected right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty.

Prior to the enactment of the 2001 anti-terrorism provisions, the only other preventive detention scheme in the Criminal Code was the dangerous offender regime. But to be found a dangerous offender or a long-term offender under Part XXIV of the Criminal Code, an offender must have been already convicted of a serious personal injury offence, and there must be evidence that the individual constitutes a threat to the life, safety, or physical and mental well-being of other persons based on evidence of repetitive or persistent serious criminal behaviour. By contrast, the anti-terrorism Criminal Code provisions permit the arrest and detention of individuals, who have not been convicted or even charged with any offence, based on what they might do. (A: *I mean, that's really something, hey.*)

The current preventive detention scheme is already constitutionally suspect. The proposed amendments in Bill C-51 will further lower the threshold for preventive arrest and detention, increasing the risk that entirely innocent people will be swept up on mere suspicion. (A: *And so will nuisance people, just nuisances.*) Under the current s. 83.3(2) of the Criminal Code, a peace officer is empowered to lay an information and bring an individual before a provincial court judge if the officer:

(a) believes on reasonable grounds that a terrorist activity will be carried out; and

(b) suspects on reasonable grounds that the imposition of a recognizance with conditions on a person, or the arrest of a person, is necessary to prevent the carrying out of the terrorist activity.

Where exigent circumstances exist, or where laying the information would be impractical, the individual may be arrested without a warrant.

The new measures would allow law enforcement agencies to arrest somebody if they suspect that a terrorist act “may be carried out,” instead of the current standard of “will be carried out.” Bill C-51 also substitutes “likely” for “necessary” such that s. 83.3(2) would now enable a peace officer to lay an information or effect a warrantless arrest if the officer:

(a) believes on reasonable grounds that a terrorist activity may be carried out; and

(b) suspects on reasonable grounds that the imposition of a recognizance with conditions on a person, or the arrest of a person, is likely to prevent the carrying out of the terrorist activity.

Both changes result in a significant lowering of the standard for arrest and detention.

The changes to the law are significant in two respects. The substitution of “may” where it currently says “will” is a significant watering down of the standard. “Will,” when coupled with “reasonable grounds to believe,” denotes evidence-based probability, whereas “may” denotes mere possibility.



The shift from “necessary” to “likely” is equally important. Necessity in this context suggests that the police officer suspects that no measure other than arrest will prevent a terrorist act. Likelihood is not necessity. Under the new provision, the police officer need only suspect that the arrest is more likely than not to prevent terrorist activity.

Canadians do not want government to arrest individuals based on religious and ethnic stereotypes. But under the new standard, it will be nearly impossible to challenge their decisions.

### No-fly list powers

Bill C-51 codifies the Minister of Public Safety’s power to put Canadians on a so-called no-fly list, which prevents them from getting on an airplane. The minister can add anyone to the no-fly list on mere suspicion that he or she will engage in an act that would threaten transportation security or travel by air for the purpose of committing an act of terrorism.

Putting someone on the no-fly list is a significant restraint on liberty. And once on the no-fly list, the procedure to have one’s name removed from the list is complex and difficult. Someone on the no-fly list has the right to appeal the minister’s decision to a judge of the Federal Court, but it is a very narrow and futile appeal. It is not nearly enough for the individual to show that the minister was wrong to put them on the no-fly list; they must also show that the minister had acted unreasonably.

Moreover, the review procedures in Bill C-51 for challenging the no-fly list designation incorporates the procedure from the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act’s byzantine security certificate regime. This means the minister can ask the Court to hold part of the hearing in secret—the individual challenging his or her no-fly list designation, their lawyer and the public are excluded from the courtroom when the government presents its case. The judge hearing the appeal can base his or her entire decision on evidence that was presented during the secret portion of the hearing.

*(A: Oh, George Orwell, he had it all right, hey.)*

In 2007, the Supreme Court held that this procedure was unconstitutional under s. 7 of the Charter when applied to the judicial review of the detention of a non-citizen detained pursuant to a security certificate. Although being put on the no-fly list is a less serious restraint on liberty than being subject to a security certificate, s. 7 of the Charter is still triggered, and thus the core protections of s. 7, such as the right to know the case to meet, should apply. The currently proposed procedure unequivocally violates that right.

Clayton C. Ruby is one of Canada’s leading lawyers, an outspoken proponent of freedom of the press, a prominent member of the environmental community and a member of the Order of Canada.

Nader R. Hasan practices criminal and constitutional law at both the trial and appellate levels and is also an adjunct professor at the University of Toronto,

Faculty of Law. They are partners at Ruby Shiller Chan Hasan Barristers. (A: ...which is lawyers.)

So it's all coming down, folks. And it's no surprise to me. It's no shock. Because I knew at the beginning that since ARPA, then DARPA, was in control of the Internet, long before you got ahold of it, and before they *gave* it to you, they wanted you all on it for their own particular reasons, including definitely surveillance, complete, and personality profiling and so on. And I knew too, as they say, from different leaks that have come out over many years, from different people, that they would have erode it away until... Don't worry though, they'll leave you with your, you know, the things that you love to do, video games and stuff and cartoons. Pornography of course, they'll make sure that keeps going, that's how they got so many folk on it in the first place, they made sure everyone knew there was lots of pornography on it. And you will play yourself too and stay on safe topics, the New Age for instance, and reincarnation, and Bigfoot and all these things that keep you harmless to the government. That's what they want you to be involved in, things which are utterly harmless and irrelevant to life in general. That's how bad it is.

So, it's all coming down the pike. And your self-policing, if you're not self-policing you should be in your private phone calls because folk can try and trip you up, maybe, you know, you don't know when you're getting set up, you never do, by anybody. Don't ever be fooled. Even if you think you know the person, because you have spoken to them before or they have emailed you before, anything like that, be very, very careful. Because it will be used against you, as I have been saying for years. Every word that you utter will be used against you. Even jokes, jokes are not safe at all. Because if you were to hear, for instance, in court, not that you will under all the new laws, part of a recording being played, it's completely different than having a lawyer or a prosecutor read it in a flat tone, that there's no inflections there, there's no humor there, there's no joking mood involved. So whatever you say can be used. Did you really say this? *Well...* That's it, you see.

And the Stasi really is all there. And with the ongoing anti-terrorism, which is going to go on way past your lives and the next generation's lives, because this is the one they hit on to get the whole agenda through, to keep you safe of course - again, the good reason but not the real reason - then it's all a done deal as far as I'm concerned. So be careful. That's all you can do now is be careful. Be very, very careful because it's not safe to give your opinions on things, no matter how innocent the topic of the conversation, or even private conversations. As I've said for years to people when they've phoned me up, *be careful, there is a third ear on every call*. But they forget, most of them.

Well, from Hamish and myself from Ontario, Canada, it's good night and may your God or your gods go with you.

Topics of show covered in following links:

[Call for a World Parliament reinforced at second Global Week of Action](#)

['Freedom in jeopardy': Thousands rally across Canada against new anti-terror law](#)

[CSIS highlights white supremacist threat ahead of radical Islam](#)

**Alan's Materials Available for Purchase and Ordering Information:**

- BOOKS** "Cutting Through" & "Waiting for the Miracle....."  
Volumes 1, 2, 3      Also available in Spanish or Portuguese translation:  
"Esperando el Milagro....." ([Español](#)) & "Esperando um Milagre....." ([Português](#))
- CDs** Ancient Religions and History MP3 CDs: & Blurbs and 'Cutting Through the Matrix' Shows on MP3 CDs (Up to 50 Hours per Disc)  
Part 1 (1998) and  
Part 2 (1998-2000)
- DVDs** "Reality Check Part 1" & "Reality Check Part 2 - Wisdom, Esoterica and ...TIME"